DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 947 HE 000 277

By-Clark, Burton R.

The Role of Faculty Authority.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
Pub Date 20 Jun 63
Note-17p.; Paper presented at the President's Institute, Harvard Business School, June 20, 1963.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.95
Descriptors-*Bureaucracy, College Faculty, *Faculty, Faculty Mobility, *Faculty Organizations, *Higher Education, Institutional Environment, Power Structure, *Professional Recognition

A strong trend toward a federated structure in colleges and universities is affectin g faculty authority by weakening faculty as a whole and strengthening the faculty in its many parts. The collection of professional experts on one campus represents a system of groups with similar status and power that coexist or battle with each other within the structure. At large universities faculty authority resembles what is called "professional authority" in hospitals, industry, and research and development laboratories. But where peer professionals in these other organizations work closely toward one goal, faculty authority is divided between departments, colleges, and separate or allied disciplines. Faculty influence on campus is enhanced by the growing availability of external sources of support such as grants from the federal government, and a labor market which is highly favorable to the professor. The basic weakness of this federated structure is that chaos may occur if there is no strong leadership to channel the efforts of and mediate conflicts between the groups. The university president should serve as mediator, unify the diverse groups on campus, and at the same time maintain the overall objectives of the institution in order to "move the whole enterprise another foot ahead." (WM)

THE ROLE OF FACULTY AUTHORITY

Burton R. Clark

Center for the Study of Higher Education

University of California (Berkeley)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Ref.

THE ROLE OF FACULTY AUTHORITY

Burton R. Clark

Center for the Study of Higher Education

University of California (Berkeley)

In this brief presentation, I would like to proceed as follows: (1) to talk about faculty authority in relation to basic changes taking place in the work and structure of the American campus. In doing this, I will attempt to relate three ideas to one another--the concept of faculty authority, the concept of professional autonomy, and the concept of federation--and also to present and criticize the contention that the college and university of today can be likened to a community, an interpretation taken recently by John D. Millett in his book, The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization; (2) to relate faculty authority to the role of the president, to the "natural interests" of the president's position. Here I would like to consider some points about the role of the president raised in recent months, in the book by Harold W. Dodds, President Emeritus of Princeton University, entitled The Academic President--Educator or Caretaker?, and in the papers given by Clark Kerr, President of the University of California, in the Godkin Lectures at Harvard this past spring on The Uses of the University.

Throughout this talk, I will adopt an interest-group perspective on campus affairs, working from an orientation that assumes men's interests differ naturally, differ because of their various locations, commitments, and tasks, and that these differences quite naturally lead to conflict. This assumption is an old tried-and-true one, one evidenced, for example, in the thinking of James Madison and others among the Founding Fathers when they laid down

---

Paper presented at the President's Institute, Harvard Business School, June 20, 1963.

the constitutional foundations of our government. Madison, in the Federalist Paper No. 10, (The Union a Check on Faction) observed that one cannot expect to remove all the causes of faction, but must be content, if liberty is to be preserved, to control the effects of faction. "The latent causes of faction are...sown in the nature of man," the nature being that men will have different sentiments and opinions because of their different positions in society. Faction is always present, dampened or excited, channeled or raging out of control, according to how we handle it. And perhaps Madison was thinking of the Harvard of 1787, as well as of civil society, when he went on to observe:

"So strong is this propensity of mankind to fall into mutual animosities, that where no substantial occasion presents itself, the most frivolous and fanciful distinctions have been sufficient to kindle their unfriendly passions and excite their most violent conflicts."

The American college of today, I am sure you will agree, would be an ideal place to test a theory of factions--any theory of conflict--but particularly a theory of conflict that assumes interdependence in decision-making. A useful theory of <u>administration</u> in our day, it seems to me, must assume (1) conflict, and (2) that decisions are not unilateral for the most part--they do not lie in the hands of one party alone. It is precisely the failure to assume conflict and extensive interdependence in decision-making among the several major parties of the campus that causes so many of our friends on the outside, who would advise us about college administration, to shudder at the way colleges are run. If these advisors wish to be kind to us, they avert their eyes from the general administrative mess they perceive, and offer one or two routine recommendations about how to improve the cafeteria. If they are more bold, they tell us frankly that only colleges and railroads could possibly be run so badly. Of course, we retort, they simply do not understand us; and it

happens that often we are right--they really do not understand the campus, particularly if they do not assume a natural diffusion of authority to different groups, and a natural and stronger-than-average need for the administration to consult and persuade, for decisions to be arrived at in an highly interdependent way.

I maintain that if we are to understand college administration, and the role of the college president in the direction of a college, we must know about the distribution of authority, particularly about the authority that becomes lodged in the hands of the faculty; and, in turn, we must know about the nature of academic work (how it differs from work in other settings), we must know about the social structure of the campus (and how it differs from other organizations), and about academic traditions. To put it broadly, theories of administration, and theories of authority, are finally dependent on theories of social organizations.

From Community to Federation

First, then, let us turn to faculty authority in relation to basic changes taking place in the structure of the American campus. I wish to highlight one trend, a trend from community to federation. John D. Millett, in his recent book, The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization, maintained that the concept of community describes quite well the modern American campus, college or university, and that the concept of community should replace the concept of hierarchy when we think about the realities of higher education or prescribe cures for its illnesses. This leading idea is supported by the following cast of assertions: academia avoids hierarchy by pluralism, with power shared by four groups--faculty, students, alumni, and administration; where hierarchy is present, it causes conflict; coordination in most colleges and universities is achieved through a dynamic of consensus; this form of integration has its models in the larger society, for the American political party and the American

governmental system also operate as communities based on consensus; consensus depends on shared respect and good will; because the college is organized differently, ideas drawn from business and public administration do not apply to higher education, and organizational theory based on social science is also largely irrelevant, since it too is sold on hierarchy.

Millett's pursuit of community reflects an effort to grasp the unusual features of the college and the university, especially the uncommon ways of exercising influence and structuring authority. Unfortunately, we gain little if anything in our understanding of the campus when we substitute a relatively pure notion of community for a simple conception of hierarchy. A concept with considerable explanatory power for the small campus of a century ago, the idea of a community, if taken alone, must now occupy a minor place in our thinking. True, "community" remains a valuable symbol in the ideologies of higher education (we use it all the time in promoting rapport, identification, and loyalty), but such use should not be confused with serious analysis of the character of campuses, of the way they actually are, especially in the case of the larger places where most students and faculty are (and who among us is not at a campus becoming somewhat more like the larger ones?). The point is: campuses have moved <u>from</u> community, from it toward bureaucratic federation of departments, colleges, schools, business offices, and student personnel establishments. In the separate units of the federation, and in the federation as a whole, there is no denying the presence of hierarchies. What Millett attempted to highlight by stressing community over bureaucracy is the extensive consultation and persuasion--the great amount of lateral coordination--that occurs when bureaucratic, hierarchical structure is crossed with faculty authority. The campus contains several major forms of authority--trustee

authority, bureaucratic authority, faculty authority--and what we must come to understand are the ways in which these forms of authority conflict and co-exist, differentiate and blend, expedite and hamper work. The concept of community may serve us well in this undertaking, but only if we use it in sophisticated relationship to the phenomena of bureaucracy and the phenomena I wish to come to here of professionalism, collegiality and federation.

First, then, we must loosen our grasp on such notions as "community," and "community of scholars" to understand the modern campus. Why? Because a number of trends have been and are now today rapidly changing the nature of the campus as a social system. Increasing size is the most obvious; increasing internal complexity is another almost as obvious. The academic fields proliferate and major areas move apart, e.g., the natural sciences from the humanities. Administrative staffs grow from president, secretary and registrar to specialists in charge of fund-raising, alumni affairs, public relations, admissions, business affairs, counseloring, and that most onerous of all tasks, the supervision of student conduct--a task that faculties have been all too willing to hand over to deans of students and other student personnel officials. Along with the growth in size and the increasing internal complexity, we also have increased specialization of work and of interest all along the line. The specialization is apparent in the case of the administrative positions just mentioned, and it is apparent in the academic fields: men specialize within a sphere of chemistry, within a limited span of English literature, or as a sociologist of religion, or of industry, or of education. Such specialization, in lesser degree, is occurring in the liberal arts college, as well as in the university where we most expect it. If a chemistry or biology department in a liberal arts college is to keep up, it must allow specialization, and then attempt to provide a general coverage of the field for students by assembling

a somewhat larger array of men, each to teach to his strength.

The trend from community toward federation, in the social organization of the campus, has implications for authority and for the freedom of individual faculty members.

Implications for authority. As campuses increase in size, complexity, and internal specialization, there is less chance that the faculty will be able to operate effectively as a total faculty in college affairs, less as a collegium, less as the kind of governmental body we have in mind when we speak of a "community of scholars," or when we harken back to the self-government of the old European universities that was expressed through teacher guilds and student guilds. What decision-making power and influence the faculty has is now more segmented--segmented by sub-college, by division, and particularly by department. Men move apart in their interests--indeed in their very vocabularies; these interests cluster around the departments (which are structural expressions of the disciplines); and faculty participation in government tends to move out to these foci of faculty commitment. The faculty as a whole finds it must move from Town Hall to representative government, and we thus find greater differentiation between those who participate a great deal and those who participate very little.

In addition to the segmenting of faculty authority, modern trends in college organization press for administrative coordination via the written rule. Both the administration and the faculty seek to counter the centrifugal forces of fragmentation by elaborating the rules, in order that there may be some over-arching coordination of an organization that not only grows larger, more complex, and more specialized, but also has stronger-than-average inclinations to diffuse authority, what with faculty, administration, and trustees all

having a legitimate claim on decision-making. Thus the specialists in the administration write rules in order to have systematic and fair procedures across the system. Thus the men in the faculty who specialize in faculty government--men who are always on one of the important committees or who are listened to at the meetings of the academic senate or representative assembly--these men also write rule-books. They too must do so, if they are to communicate, coordinate, and act with some fairness.

Implications for freedom of individual faculty member. I have said that as campuses move from a character that roughly approximates that of a community to that approaching a federation there are more formal rules, more bureaucratic coordination. How does this affect the freedom of the faculty member? The answer sounds easy--he is less free. But the answer is not so straightforward apparently. In certain areas of his activity, the faculty man surely is constrained by the bureaucratic coordination imposed on the federated structure. And we could dwell at some length on the increased paperwork to which we are all subjected, and on the pain of filling out forms. The travel voucher at my own university sometimes seems sufficient cause in itself to join the American Association of University Professors or even the more militant American Federation of Teachers. To get to the travel voucher, one must have applied for travel funds to a faculty committee some months before and here there is always, it seems, a "Rule 271.3" to get around. In such areas--accounting for funds, business affairs generally--it is clear that the rulebook and the paperwork are permanently with us, ever to reign supreme. Does this mean, however, that the faculty member is less free than he used to be? When we turn to other areas of activity of the faculty member, particularly those of central concern to him--what kind of work will he do, who will his colleagues

half--we find the forces of personal autonomy fighting a non-collegiation-loving battle against the forces of coordination. In fact, despite the loss of economic battles, professors may be winning the war of personal autonomy.

In his recent Godkin lectures, Clark Kerr made the suggestion that the power of the individual faculty member is going up while the power of the collective faculty is going down. Keep had the large university in mind, where the big time commercial, athletic, or consultant increasingly relates to the grant-giving agencies of the Federal Government and to the foundations. This entrepreneurial activity has had remarkable growth, and the personal autonomy and power thus achieved, vis-a-vis others in the university, is considerable. Thus Kerr's point is one we must take into account: the direct relation of faculty members to external sources of support affects the distribution of influence within the campus. Collective bodies of the faculty or the administration are hardly in a position, or are inclined, to tell the faculty member he can have this consumer but not that one. We undoubtedly will see more efforts at collective control, since much is at stake by way of the balance of the curriculum, the rewards of the faculty, and even the character of the institution as a whole. But such efforts will need to tread gently, for the right of the faculty man to pursue his own scholarly interests is a sensitive one. When the faculty member feels this right is being infringed, he may run up the banner of academic freedom over his office and start hauling out memos--or manifestos--to his colleagues. Or, very likely, he will start looking around for greener pastures and begin to listen to the siren call of offers. Which brings us to a second major source of increased personal autonomy--the competitive job market. The job market runs very much in the professor's favor these days, and his favorable position in the market enhances his

position on campus. He can demand more and get it; he can even become courageous. In the world of work, having another job to go to is perhaps the most important source of courage.

What is the essential point in what I have said thus far? It is that we are witnessing a strong trend toward a federated structure in colleges and especially in universities--with the campus more like an United Nations and less like a small town--and this trend affects faculty authority by weakening the faculty as a whole and strengthening the faculty in its many parts. Faculty authority becomes less a case of self-government by a collegium, and more a case of authority exercised department by department, sub-college by sub-college. The role of faculty authority then shifts from protecting the rights of the guild, the rights of "the faculty," to a role of protecting the autonomy of the separate disciplines and the autonomy of the individual faculty member.

If my analysis is approximately correct, we are in a position perhaps to profit from comparing what occurs in academic organizations with what occurs in other organizations. For faculty authority now tends to be somewhat similar to what in other contexts is now called "professional authority." Almost everywhere in modern organizations, we find a tug-of-war going on between professional and administrative (bureaucratic) orientations. In the hospital, the tug-of-war takes the form of conflict between the M.D. and the non-medical administrator. In industry, where many kinds of professionals are employed--lawyers, accountants, and so on--we are witnessing a fascinating case of clash between professional and bureaucratic orientations in the new research and development laboratories that are now so essential.[1] The fantastic expansion of the

---

[1] See William Kornhauser, Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation (Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1962); and Simon Marcaon, The Scientist in American Industry (New York: Harpers and Brothers, 1960).

R and D labs has brought over 400,000 scientists and engineers into industry, there to be committed to research, to innovation, and to the development of new inventions to the point of practical utility. Many of these technologists have a high degree of expertise, a strong interest in research--often "pure" research--and they press for a very large degree of freedom. Often their fondest wish is to be left completely alone, and they make the point that in the case of scientific work it is rational in the long-run to leave men alone, that basic discoveries stem not from managerial direction but from the scientist following up his own ideas and the leads he develops as he proceeds. Management has found such men particularly difficult to deal with--their morale suffers easily from ordinary (traditional) forms of management, and they present unusual demands on management to change and accommodate. In this situation, professional authority and bureaucratic authority, both necessary, have quite different functions: professional authority serves to protect the exercise of the special expertise of the technologist, allowing his judgment to be the pre-eminent one in many matters. Bureaucratic authority functions to provide coordination, coordination of the work of the technologists with the other major elements of the firm. Bureaucratic direction is not capable of providing the expert judgment; professional direction is not capable of providing the over-all coordination. The problem presented by the scientist in industry has been how to serve simultaneously the requirements of autonomy and the requirements of coordination, and how to accommodate the authority of the professional man and his group of peers to the authority of management and vice versa.

Everywhere, the professional-in-the-organization presents this special kind of problem. The problem takes somewhat different forms and intensities, however, in different contexts. Academic man is a case of the modern profes-

sional man in the organization, but he is in some respects an extreme and special case. Of all professionals, academic man needs rather extreme personal autonomy, for research that leads where he knows not, or for teaching that is unfettered by dictated dogma, or for scholarship that follows the rules of consistency and proof that develop within a descipline. Whereas most professionals are practitioners, practicing received ideas, arts, and skills, academic men are more committed to innovation, criticism, and interpretation in a world of ideas.

Too, the college and especially the university brings together in one place a wide variety of experts. In most cases of professionals-in-organizations, there are one or two professional groups who, to the extent they have influence, substitute some professional control for administrative control. This occurs in the case of medical personnel in the hospital, who often dominate decision-making. The internal controls of the medical profession are quite strong and are substituted for those of the organization. But in the college or university, there are twelve, twenty-five or fifty different clusters of experts. The experts are prone to identify with their own discipline, and the "academic profession" over-all comes off a poor second. No one of these disciplines on a campus is likely to dominate the others; at a minimum, it usually takes an alliance of disciplines, such as those referred to as "the natural sciences" or "the humanities" to put together a strong bloc that might dominate others. The point is that in the face of such a variety of experts--chemists, linguists, professors of marketing--the collective control of the professionals is not likely to be strong. The campus is not a closely-knit group of professionals who see the world from one perspective. As a collection of professionals, it is decentralized, loose and flabby. To sum up this point:

where professional influence is high and there is one dominant professional group, we may find an organization unified by the imposition of professional standards. But the university, and the growing liberal arts college, is fractured by its expertness, not unified by it. The variety of experts supports the tendency for authority to be diffused toward quasi-autonomous clusters.

In short: faculty authority has in common with professional authority in other places the protection of individual and group autonomy. It is different from professional authority in other places in being fragmented around the interests of a large variety of groups of roughly equal status and power.

I am saying, then, that faculty authority in our time becomes <u>professional authority in a federated form</u>. We have a loosely joined collection of professionals. This combination of professionalism and a loosely-joined structure has the imposing function of <u>protecting the autonomy of the work of experts amidst great divergence</u>. I have been referring to the campus as a system with some qualities of a federation. The federation is a structure that gives reign to the simultaneous development of the interests of a variety of groups. A number of departments, divisions, sub-colleges, professional schools, institutes, and the like, can co-exist within an academic federation, each pushing its own interests and going its own way to a considerable extent.

Of course, if the trend toward federation is unhindered, we are likely to move from mere confusion to chaos in college affairs. Interest groups that contend are interests groups that conflict, and groups that go their own way generate a strong centrifugal force that strains the bonds of organization. The need to handle conflict within the federation--to contain, mollify, and channel it--in order to have some peace and to occasionally face the outside world as a unified system, this need is one source of a concern for coordination.

The need to keep the federation from flying apart presses for unifying effort. Financial sustenance also has to be apportioned to the parts of the system and this is a task for central management. In short, some integration is needed, and the central administration generally serves as the coordinating agency; the skills of diplomacy are needed and these are often provided by the administrators. The point is: coordination in federated structures is not a matter of close supervision and close day-to-day integration of specialized work--as in the case of various parts that must be brought to an assembly line--but takes such forms as adjudication of conflict among interest groups. Leadership in federations is not a matter of issuing directives about how to do the work, but takes such forms as cultivating a unifying sentiment based on areas of agreement and working to extend the areas of agreement.

Also, we should note, a basic weakness of federations is drift. There is a role for leadership in countering the drift, channeling long-term development by inserting a few critical decisions. Even in the most loosely joined enterprises, leaders can often enter decisively at key points. One critical decision in the university federation, for example, is to introduce or not to introduce a new professional school that opens the door of the federation to a whole new category of occupations that want to be professions. Certainly for the liberal arts college the introduction of graduate study of any magnitude is a critical decision; the construction of a new building containing research laboratories for the professors may well be another. Or when a university or college is suffering a loss of talent from faculty accepting positions elsewhere, it may be a critical decision to throw away the book and go all out in rewards and promises in order to retain a highly respected member of the faculty, a faculty star, who is being enticed elsewhere. In such decisions, administrators

commonly have the dominant voice, the leeway to intervene decisively in the development of the institution. Thus, even in organizational systems that tend toward the character of federated professionalism, the central administration has not only the tasks of mediation and coordination but also occasional opportunity to exercise what is commonly referred to by the term "leadership."

This brings us to some of the recent arguments about the role of the college president in the modern academy. Harold Dodds has stated the traditional position, that the college president, if he tries hard enough and pays attention to educational matters instead of business matters, can indeed be an educational leader, day-by-day, week-by-week, providing a unifying influence and steering the institution toward central long-term objectives. This is difficult to do, Dodds would admit, and it can hardly be done to the degree and in the style of the Great Presidents of the past, who labored under the conditions of another time. It demands a bootstrap approach; the role of leadership does not naturally fall into the office of the president these days, and it is easily avoided, but with deliberate intent a man can refashion the role. The role is necessary because the college must have a unifying force and must keep a sense of central purpose. Clark Kerr, in the recent Godkin Lectures here at Harvard, took a quite different approach. It was a central point of his lectures that the president is now a mediator among many conflicting forces, and he pointed to students, alumni, federal government, and so on, as well as the faculty, in stressing the many directions in which the president must face. The president is not two-faced, he said; he is a many-faced character. His first task is to maintain peace, and he must consult and persuade in the style of the mediator to find the workable compromises that resolve current problems. Beyond this lies a second task of progress, and there are no neat guide-lines here, other

than the general ends of preserving truth, creating new knowledge, and serving the needs of man through truth and knowledge. The qualities most needed by the president are judgment, courage, and fortitude, particularly fortitude. The president must be content to hold the constituent elements loosely together, and "to move the whole enterprise another foot ahead."

Clearly, in the large, the portrait I have drawn of federated structure, professionalism, and decentralized faculty authority comes closer to Kerr's characterization of the campus than to that of Harold Dodds. I, too, believe that the president's role has moved from towering autocracy to moderate mediation, and not the least of the reasons is that the faculties are larger, more internally differentiated, and more expert. The president of today, compared to his predecessors, certainly must practice more the art of muddling through--of picking his way step by step through a tangled web of conflicting values and standards. Hence, mediation is an important ingredient of the role. But what will be fascinating to study and disentangle in the coming years are the various forms of mediation, or the ways that mediation is combined with other styles of management and leadership. I will take a stab at a start by suggesting one distinction: there is mediation pure and simple, with the mediator a relatively neutral party; and there is mediation with certain substantive outcomes in mind, where the mediator is not neutral. In the first case, mediation is more of an end in itself, or a means serving the end of resolving conflict, and this form is similar to mediation in industry-labor relations. In the second case, mediation is an administrative tool for moving toward certain objectives the president has in mind. Both styles of mediation find a place in a federated structure; but the second form says that the administration also has a point of view, also has certain over-riding sub-

stantive concerns, also will fight when other groups step on its vested interpretation. This second style is not neutral in respect to choice among programs, to educational values. It steers in a certain direction. It allows for the possibility that educational leadership can be exercised by Great Administrators as well as Great Autocrats. Clearly, conditions are no longer ripe for the autocratic leader, for the imposing figure who rides his white horse across campus every day and leads by issuing orders. But because the autocrat is gone, have we come to the end of leadership? The role of pure mediation for the college president would say yes; but the role of mediation-with-purpose would say no. It would say that presidential leadership is exercised in muted, administrative ways--that the style of leadership has changed to a less romantic form, as the college has become more bureaucratized, and authority diffused to and within the faculty. Presidential leadership is a necessary counterforce, and the most important counterforce to the equally necessary, but divisive, federated professionalism of the faculty. As I have said drift is a basic problem in a federation. When the president's role is played only as a neutral mediation, it does not stay the drift--indeed, may add to it. Finally, then, the will to lead is important in the president's office. The will may often need to be modest, muted, indirect--even clever and manipulative--in its expression, but it remains an important ingredient of the successful modern campus. Thus, I would hope that the old-fashioned conception of the leader as one who has ends in mind and shapes the organization to achieve those ends, that this conception will continue to inform the work of college presidents, even as we recognize the limitations imposed on that work by the phenomena of bureaucracy, federation and professionalism.